To: Woodbury, Lynn[woodburyl@cdmsmith.com]; Wall, Dan[wall.dan@epa.gov]; OBrien, Wendy[OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov]
Cc: Greene, Nikia[Greene.Nikia@epa.gov]; David Shanight[shanightdt@cdmsmith.com]
From: Partridge, Charles[/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=27DA56DA9A12472787EF56077099CF36-PARTRIDGE, CHARLES]
Sent: Wed 12/18/2019 7:06:23 PM (UTC)
Subject: RE: Meconium tables-figures

I like this one the best, it is the most transparent

cp

From: Woodbury, Lynn <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 12:04 PM
To: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; OBrien, Wendy <OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov>
Cc: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; David Shanight <shanightdt@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: RE: Meconium tables-figures

Here are the figures with the dry weight concentrations added for the McDermott concentrations. As indicated in the footnote, the conversion assumes a moisture content of 70%.

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Lynn Woodbury | CDM Smith | 555 17th Street, Suite 500 | Denver, CO 80202 | direct: 303.383.2382 | fax: 303.308.3003 | woodburyL@cdmsmith.com

---

From: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 11:56 AM
To: Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; Woodbury, Lynn <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>; OBrien, Wendy <OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov>
Cc: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; Shanight, David <ShanightDT@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: RE: Meconium tables-figures

Sure I have not problem with that. Could we add two additional columns after the mcdernott wet weight numbers, or does that get too busy?

cp

From: Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 11:48 AM
To: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>; Lynn Woodbury <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>; OBrien, Wendy <OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov>
Cc: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; David Shanight <shanightdt@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: RE: Meconium tables-figures

I would recommend that we plot the dw numbers for mcdermott et al. unless anyone has objections.

From: Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 11:45 AM
To: Lynn Woodbury <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; OBrien, Wendy <OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov>
Cc: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; David Shanight <shanightdt@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: RE: Meconium tables-figures

Note: 13 studies listed in the table, represents 3,426 individual infant's meconium samples
Butte study 32 infants. Results of the 17 infants in the SC study do not come anywhere close to any values of the 3,426 infant values we reviewed in the literature.

From: Woodbury, Lynn <woodburyl@cdmsmith.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 11:30 AM
To: Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; Partridge, Charles <Partridge.Charles@epa.gov>; OBrien, Wendy <OBrien.Wendy@epa.gov>
Cc: Greene, Nikia <Greene.Nikia@epa.gov>; David Shanight <shanightdt@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: Meconium tables-figures

Draft, Confidential

All –

Here is a updated summary of the meconium literature table and the graphs for all metals. A few items of note:

- I added in the Gonzales de Dios et al. (1996) results. Based on discussions with Charlie (and with the help of GoogleTranslate!), the values shown are based on the full-term infant group presented in **Table III** (not Table V). These values match those summarized by MT Resources. The values from this study are shown in green text in the master table.

- I corrected a typo in the earlier version of the master table. The copper concentration for the Turker et al. (2006) study should be 116.8 (not 11.8). See value in blue text.

- In preparing the graphs, I noticed what appears to be an error in the Cassoulet et al. (2019) citation. Inspection of Table 4 in the citation shows the range of reported lead concentrations as "<LOQ – 0.35 ppm"; however, the mean concentration is reported as "1.83 ppm"…obviously, the mean cannot be higher than the maximum, so there is an error somewhere. I have included the values in the figure as presented in the citation, recognizing they are illogical.

- In the figures, all values are being shown as reported in the original citation. No attempt has been made to incorporate any wet/dry weight adjustments. We are still in the process of evaluating the various "poop-prep" techniques in each study to determine the weight basis of the concentrations from each source. As noted in my earlier email, differences in weight basis could result in concentration shifts of 3-4x, but should not alter the overall conclusions.

Take a look and let me know if you have any suggestions for changes/additions.
Thanks,
Lynn

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
Lynn Woodbury | CDM Smith | 555 17th Street, Suite 500 | Denver, CO 80202 | direct: 303.383.2382 | fax: 303.308.3003 | woodburyL@cdmsmith.com